

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference PD53529PC	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Form PCT/IPEA/416	
International application No. PCT/SE2003/001147	International filing date (day/month/year) 30-06-2003	Priority date (day/month/year) 09-07-2002
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC G09B7/04, G06F17/30		
Applicant VOCAB AB ET AL		

1. This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.

3. This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, comprising:

a. ☒ (sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau) a total of 5 sheets, as follows:

☒ sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).

☐ sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.

b. ☐ (sent to the International Bureau only) a total of (indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)) _____, containing a sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in computer readable form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).

4. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

☒ Box No. I Basis of the report

☐ Box No. II Priority

☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention

☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited

☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 09-02-2004	Date of completion of this report 07-10-2004
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/SE Patent- och registreringsverket Box 5055 S-102 42 STOCKHOLM Facsimile No. +46 8 667 72 88	Authorized officer Pär Heimdal /LR Telephone No. +46 8 782 25 00

Form PCT/IPEA/409 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/SE2003/001147

Box No. I Basis of the report

1. With regard to the language, this report is based on the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
- ☐ This report is based on a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of:
- ☐ international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
- ☐ publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
- ☐ international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)
2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this report is based on *(replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report)*:
- ☐ the international application as originally filed/furnished
- ☒ the description:
- pages 1-14 as originally filed/furnished
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☒ the claims:
- pages _____ as originally filed/furnished
- pages* _____ as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19
- pages* 15-19 received by this Authority on 09-08-2004
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☒ the drawings:
- pages 5 as originally filed/furnished
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____
- ☐ a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) – see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.
3. ☐ The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:
- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (specify): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify): _____
4. ☐ This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).
- ☐ the description, pages _____
- ☐ the claims, Nos. _____
- ☐ the drawings, sheets/figs _____
- ☐ the sequence listing (specify): _____
- ☐ any table(s) related to the sequence listing (specify): _____

* If item 4 applies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/SE2003/001147

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>1-24</u>	YES
	Claims		NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	<u>1-24</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-24</u>	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

CITATIONS

The examination process has revealed the following documents:

D1: WO 0199083 A1

D2: DE 4408459 A1

THE INVENTION

This report concerns the invention according to the amended claims 1-24, amended on 09-08-2004. The claimed invention according to claims 1-24 solves the problem of facilitate individual learning and to provide a user access at any desired point or location.

STATEMENT

Document D1, which is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of the claimed invention, reveals a system and method for individual interactive learning, see abstract and claim 1. The system includes a user terminal from which the user can participate in the interactive learning, see figure 3. The user terminal could consist of e.g. a cellular telephone or a PDA, see claim 18-19. Further, the system comprises a communication network, a database with user specific information and a database containing information concerning the content of the service. The mode of using the system is registered in the database in association with user specific information. The user must identify himself to the system, see claim 3. Questions are sent to the user, see claim 4. If the users answer is incorrect, the failure is registered in the user specific database, see claim 7. The system offers individual training based on the users level of knowledge, see claims 1, 5 and 7. Further, D1 presents how the system could

.../...

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/SE2003/001147

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.
Continuation of: BOX V

perform tests within different fields of knowledge. Depending on how the user answers, the user could receive new tests based on the result he achieved during earlier tests, see page 7, line 16-21.

The "content data base" according to the application is considered equivalent with the "database with information concerning the content of the service" described in D1.

The "system data base for storing user specific data" is considered equivalent with "data base with user specific information" in D1.

"Administration means providing said user to control the system", according to the application, is considered equivalent with that the user in D1 is inter acting with the service and is able to select between a plurality of services, see page 3, line 24-26. "Diagnosis means" correspond to "test within different areas of knowledge" in D1.

The knowledge of the user is estimated by the system according to D1 and the intensity and degree of difficulty of the teaching is adapted to the user, see page 3, line 24-28. This is considered to correspond to the prediction of the user's knowledge described in the application.

The invention as defined in claims 1, 14 and 24 differs from what is known from document D1 in that a different vocabulary is used, and in administrative measures, not belonging to the field of patentability.

Consequently, with the background of D1, the problem is to design an alternative method and system which achieves individually adapted learning.

The invention according to claims 1, 14 and 24 is not considered to contribute to any art within the field of patentability. The invention according to these claims consequently lacks inventive step.

.../...

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/SE2003/001147

Supplemental Box

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Continuation of: BOX V

The invention according to dependent claims 2-6, 11-13, 15-23 is considered to present only slight constructional changes which comes within the scope of the customary practice followed by persons skilled in the art, especially as the advantages thus achieved can readily be foreseen. Consequently, the subject-matter of claim 2-6, 11-13, 15-23 also lacks an inventive step.

The difference between the invention according to claims 7-10 and what is described in D1 is that the invention according to the application could extract information from a text and present it to a user. As the system further is aware of the users knowledge level, a vocabulary presenting words which are predicted to be unknown to the user is presented. The system could also be used as an electronic dictionary presenting words the user do not know.

Document D2 describes a learning system. From D2 is it known how information is extracted from e.g. a data base and presented to a user on a computer screen. The system present words according to the knowledge level of the user, to let him focus on words the system estimates that he do not know.

As both documents D1 and D2 concerns learning systems it is considered obvious to a person skilled in the art to adapt the system according to D1 with the features presented in D2, thus achieving a system according to claims 7-10. The invention according to these claims consequently lack inventive step.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

International application No.

PCT/SE2003/001147

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

The invention according to claims 1-24 is not considered to be clear and concise, in accordance with Article 6, PCT.

The way of claiming used in claims 1-24, involves the mere mentioning of a result the invention is intended to achieve, rather than specifying the technical means for achieving the intended result. E.g. in claim 1 and 14 is mentioned that the user's knowledge "is predicted by the system", without specification in the description how this prediction is made. The description only gives example on how knowledge estimation is performed (by making diagnostic tests). No example is given on how knowledge prediction is performed.

In claims 4, 16-17 and 19 the word "optimised" is used as a qualifier for defining the scope of the claims. E.g. claim 4 claim protection for a system where the learning tool comprises a "tool for optimised repetition". It is however not clear what is meant with word "optimised", as something could be optimised in several different aspects. No further explanation that distinguishes "optimised repetition" from "repetition" has been detected in the description. The used expression "optimised" thus creates obscurity in the definition of the subject matter to be protected.

In claim 15 is the definition "a sufficient number of times" used, which cannot be considered to define the scope of the claim in a clear and concise way.

The made amendment in claims 1 and 14, "using time as a parameter" lacks explicit support in the description.